

gets a few million from this source that it will not seek it from other sources.

Mr. MILLS. They are going to seek it from other sources until they get enough money to run the campaign. You know that and I know that. If they can get two-thirds of what they want here then they only have to get one-third from other sources.

Does not my good friend from New Jersey agree that this is a good way to bring about broadening the contribution base, and it would not hurt us to at least try to broaden the base, so as to get more people helping with the political campaign costs so that we do not have to go to a few people and get more from them?

Mr. JOELSON. I would answer that by saying we are not broadening the base; we are just fattening up the till.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think my friend from New Jersey understands the amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question here is: Are we stacking it against minority groups by really subsidizing through the Government the major parties?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know whether my friend from Pennsylvania was on the floor or not, but the argument has just been made by others that we are stacking it for them.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am speaking in a different context.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think we are stacking it for or against.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am raising the other question.

Mr. MILLS. We are going to recognize a third party whenever that third party gets more than 5 million votes. In that event we will help that party to some degree and whenever it gets 15 million votes, in the previous presidential election, it will become a full party in the division of the money with the other major parties.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question then is this: You are making it the equivalent of one vote and one dollar. That is one of the cheapest elections I ever heard of, where you get a vote for every dollar in your party.

I might say to the gentleman, if I were in one of the what we now call organized groups I would certainly go on the presidential end of it, and do it quick, and altogether, because I would be able to control them. I would not have to finance the presidential end of it.

Mr. MILLS. This might help us to get money needed in congressional campaigns, and I think it would serve a good purpose if it did. But let me say this to my friend from Pennsylvania: I am sure he would—

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Is this constitutional? I do not think it is.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think there is any constitutional question.

But my friend from Pennsylvania, I am sure, would rather see 10,000 people contribute \$1 to a campaign than to see one individual contribute \$10,000 to cover the same costs.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but you see—

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman would agree with me that there is less possibility of suspicion of influence, real or unreal.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but the gentleman can see what you come to is this, when you make equivalent and equal one vote and one dollar. I really do not know what the philosophical background of that is, and whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. MILLS. What would the gentleman make of it?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would not think a dollar a vote. I do not believe I would. It may be right. I am questioning that, and saying it may not be constitutional, because I do not think public money should really finance private groups for political purposes. Maybe. I do not know. I am asking the question.

Mr. MILLS. I would think the gentleman would believe that this would be preferable than tax deductions. There is no control possible over that. I would believe that the gentleman would think this would be the better way to do it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was going to say, it seems to me that this is worth trying.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I think it is.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have heard for many years a great deal of discussion and debate about this problem. Many suggestions are made about getting away from the existing system—and of course it is possible for anybody to shoot holes in any proposal.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BINGHAM. But it seems to me, this is a proposal that is worth trying and I think it makes sense.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me so that I may answer my friend, the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MILLS. I will yield briefly to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would like to answer my friend, the gentleman from New York, whom I respect highly. Suppose somebody who believes contrary to the gentleman from New York and my particular feelings about voting rights and civil rights and all that? If Wallace in the South gets 5 million votes, we have the Government